Public Works
Engineering

CREST DRIVE COMMUNITY TEAM PROCESS TRAINING WORKSHOP #2 SUMMARY

City of Eugene
858 Pearl St 3rd Floor
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-5727
(541) 682-5598 FAX

Introduction
This summary provides a recap of the second Crest Drive Community Team (CDCT) meeting which was held on Thursday, March 23, at the Washington Park Community Center. Nineteen members of the CDCT and two alternates attended the meeting (see attached sign in sheet, pg 7). David Roth from the transportation planning team in the Public Works Engineering Division recorded meeting notes. The meeting was facilitated by Josh Reckord. The agenda follows:

1. **Warm Up**: "What do we remember from two weeks ago?"
2. **Continue Building Group Agreements**: Decision-making, meeting mechanics, and communication
3. **Activity**: Assumptions and Inferences, "Building a Wall"
4. **Activity**: Cards on the Table - What interests do we bring to the process?
5. **What do we need for a decision?** Introduction to Solution Requirements
6. **Next Steps**
7. **Debrief**

Public minutes were taken throughout the meeting and are combined with comments submitted by participants.

Warm Up: "What do we remember from two weeks ago?"
Participants were asked to share what they remembered from the previous meeting. In general, comments included the following:

- Appreciation for positive energy and attitudes during the meeting wrap-up
- Appreciation for positive energy throughout the entire meeting
- Found the consensus building process interesting
- Liked the consensus building process and instruction module

- Appreciated the discussion about unique characteristics of the Crest Drive neighborhood
- Thought the group spent a lot of time on process
- Enjoyed hearing resident's histories in the Crest Drive neighborhood

Following the group comment period, Josh Reckord provided two comments regarding last week's meeting. First, he noted the group will need to develop a "support group" to carry out administrative tasks and work directly with the chosen facilitator throughout the process. Second, he appreciated the group process and the participants' positive attitudes. During this time, a suggestion was made to use more visible name plates as opposed to small name tags. City staff will bring nameplates to the April 6th meeting. Two questions were asked during this item.

- *Question*: Why does the group need time limits for agenda items?

- *Answer*: The allotted time for agenda items is necessary to keep the meetings moving forward smoothly. It was also suggested that if additional time was needed, it could be scheduled into the following meeting agenda.
- *Question*: What is a "Support Group"?
  - *Answer*: The support group would assist with administrative, communication, and scheduling tasks throughout the entire process.

Continue Building Group Agreements

This item was a continuation of building group agreements from the previous meeting. Josh introduced the item and then opened it up for questions and comments from participants. Comments, questions and answers follow:

Decision-Making

- *Comment*: There was interest in information and discussion about other methods of group decision-making (in addition to the consensus model).
  - *Response*: The group may use the consensus model to decide to change the decision-making process at any time.
- *Question*: "Doesn't the consensus model require starting from a question?"
  - *Answer* from Josh: Not necessarily, there are multiple definitions for consensus-building.
- *Question*: "Why does the group have to spend time on the process?"
  - *Answer* 1: The group decided to go this route.
  - *Answer* 2: We first needed to work out agreements on how to work together as a group.
  - *Answer* 3: This is a compromise to get all the interests at/on the table.
  - *Answer* 4: The process will require more time initially, however will be more efficient in the long run. It is important to get decision-making agreements out of the way first.
  - *Answer* 5: The neighborhood group passed a motion to use this process.
- *Comments*: The group needs a method/process of information sharing and communication with committee members absent from previous meetings. Alternates also need to be in the information loop. All participants, including alternates, will be included in the distribution list.
  - *Response*: A motion was made to create the information sharing method/process.
- *Question*: What other methods of decision making are there besides consensus?
  - *Response*: Simply majority, majority, unanimity, plurality, etc… The group can make this decision using consensus.
- *Question*: Will there be veto power? If so, it must be written into operating rules.
- *Discussion*: The group discussed the consensus building process with Josh. Josh clarified that in a consensus building process, one person's veto cannot stop the process. He noted that further clarity would be provided during the "Interests" discussion.

At this point, Hal surveyed the group to determine their support for using consensus building to make decisions. The results are shown on the right.

Level of Support	Count
5	9
4	6
3	1
2	
1	

Immediately following this survey, several clarifying questions were asked.
- *Question:* Who are the voting members?
  - *Response:* The whole committee including City staff.
- *Question:* Can the decision making process be changed later on?

- o *Response:* Yes, if the group makes this decision using a consensus process
- *Question:* Please succinctly describe/explain consensus?
  - o *Response:* "We build decisions, we don't decide them."
  - o *Response:* Consensus means if someone disagrees, they come forward to the next meeting with an alternate proposal.
- *Question:* What if the City doesn't agree?
  - o *Response:* The City cannot override adopted mandates. These boundaries will be discussed in the next meeting.

Following these clarifying questions, the group was surveyed with a show of thumbs-up, thumbs-down to indicate support for using the consensus model for decision-making. The results were: 20 thumbs-up and 0 down, indicating strong support for the consensus model.

Meetings and Communication
Participants discussed meeting agendas, duration, scheduling, start and end times, and the potential for including allotted public comment time into agendas. Notes from the discussion follow:
- Several participants were concerned that 1 ½ hours was an inadequate amount of time for meetings
- Some suggested that 2 hours would be more appropriate and productive
- Several participants were concerned about meetings going beyond 2 hours
- Some were also concerned that bi-weekly meetings would be too frequent; monthly meetings or a more flexible schedule was suggested
- Participants preferred a regular day for meetings and most agreed that Thursdays would work best

After the discussion, participants were surveyed on meeting duration, schedule, and agenda. The results follow:

1) "Regularly scheduled meeting shall be 2 hours in duration."

Level of Support	Count
5	20
4	
3	
2	
1	

2) "Regularly scheduled meetings shall occur on Thursdays, every two weeks."

Level of Support	Count
5	18
4	2
3	
2	
1	

3) "Meeting agendas shall be distributed one-week in advance and shall be posted on the City website."

Level of Support	Count
5	20
4	
3	
2	
1	

Building an Assumption/Inference Wall
This activity was designed to surface any preexisting assumptions or inferences participants are bringing to the process. As defined by Josh,
- *To assume* is to take for granted as truth without verification

- *To infer* is to draw a conclusion about something you do not know on the basis of something you do know

Following a group discussion about assumptions and inferences, participants recorded their own assumptions and inferences about the Crest Drive Area Transportation Study on note cards which were taped to the wall. These statements follow:
- "If we don't lose hope, and if we keep working, we will get the streets we want, and our process will become the model for all of Eugene"
- "The members of our group live in our neighborhood not to develop/speculate (their property), but because they want to live in the neighborhood"
- "Neighbors don't trust the city"
- "No good will come of this process"
- "All three streets & groups from three streets want what's best for all three streets & the residents on each- they aren't just focused on their street"
- "The roads will be redone in the Crest Neighborhood"
- "The Crest/Friendly Area Neighbors don't want their neighborhood to change"
- "The street improvements will invite more, and faster traffic"
- "The cost will be astronomical"
- "The struggle between neighborhood groups and the city will be ongoing"
- "Most people in this group want minimal impact to the streets"
- "The road will be raised in front of my house and I will lose my view & my trees, because Gary McNeel said the intersection will be raised"
- "A collector street will increase traffic"
- "Majority of residents in the Crest Drive neighborhood want the streets improved"
- "The city wants to pave paradise"
- "Our problems cannot be solved with the same level of thinking that created them"
- "I infer this process can work"
- "I assume that the city staff will interpret all regulations with as much latitude as they feel they can within their professional boundaries"
- "I assume that everyone here want minimal street change"
- "I assume all of the trees in my right of way will be cut down"
- "I assume that there are people here who want no development or change to the streets"
- "All economic development is undemocratic"
- "I assume that committee members represent the area's general attitude about street development"
- "Everyone wants to have the streets fixed"
- "There will be conflict with the city over street width and sidewalks"
- "Impact of street improvement on environment are key issue of discussions"
- "Property values will decrease with improved roads"
- "This process will result in an assessment so astronomical that I will lose my house, then I will have to move in with my mother and my life will be over"
- "I assume a 'better' road that is slow, bicycle & pedestrian friendly, safe & beautiful, will be the outcome of our collaboration with the City of Eugene"
- "I infer we will not be able to choose the improvements we want without getting the ones we don't want"

What Interests do we Bring to the Process
Josh described the difference between positions and interests; *Positions* are concrete whereas
Interests are made up of needs, desires, concerns, and fears. "Focusing on interests, not positions, leads
you to choices and options that could never be considered if you only focus on concrete positions."
Participants were broken into four small groups to brainstorm individual and group interests. Notes from
the small group discussions follow:

- **Needs**
  - Breathing
  - Safe place to walk
  - Place to dump Stormwater
  - Having a say
  - A refuge, tranquility
  - Affordable place to live
  - Place to put a car
  - Design options
  - Preserve nature
  - Provide transportation options
  - Creative engineering
  - Traffic-slowing mechanisms
  - Neighborhood distinctiveness
- **Desires**
  - Maintain narrow road beds
  - Not change atmosphere
  - Allow all three streets to have their own character- allow each street to design own street
  - Put environment and people before cars and cut-through traffic
  - Control traffic speed
  - Slow roads, preserve historic landscape, scenic roads, scenic views, private craftsmanship
  - Preserve <u>all</u> trees
- **Concerns**
  - Process will break down before we get to the design process
  - Decision-makers outside the process will affect our work with this group
  - Our input is valued and actually will be part of the decisions made
  - No game playing
  - Operate in an environment of honesty and trust
  - The group might become polarized
  - We get the views of the entire neighborhood represented
- **Fears**
  - Fear of change in the neighborhood ambiance
  - Fear of more and faster traffic
  - Fear for health and safety of neighborhood wildlife
  - Fear of loss of tree canopy
  - Fear of empty wallets
  - Fear of streets being realigned too close to our homes
  - Fear of loss of social access because of street barriers
  - Fear of pitting neighbor against neighbor/street against street in street placement
    decisions
  - Fear of loss of rural feel
  - Fear the city council won't support our results

Moving Forward
Participants were asked to comment on whether they thought progress was made and to provide any other comments regarding the process. Comments written on note cards are included here:

- "Thanks for anticipating what this group will need to successfully complete our task (particularly re: city staff). Yes, I see us moving along. I sense that city staff is moving into the zone where they are positive about this process, Thanks."
- "We moved forward. I was uncomfortable after the last meeting, feel more comfortable now."
- "Good combination of process and substance tonight. Got us through rough spots to decisions. Good time management."
- Meeting was a little less positive that the last, bit more muddled. Very important issue raised- not allow people that haven't come to last meeting to take too much time with getting caught up or second guess decisions."
- "We moved forward slowly, I feel"
- "Moved forward some. Too much re-hashing of last week's agenda the 1st hour. Need to get started on time. People who have been absent from a previous meeting need to read minutes and consult with a fellow member prior to meeting."
- "Feels good."
- "Yes, we moved forward. So far, there is more trust in the group than I expected."
- "Question: why can't Storey/Crest/Friendly benefit from simply letting the Blanton Rd. model apply?"
- "We need some skills for dealing with members who seem to be so distrustful of anything/everything going on that they threaten to derail the process."
- "We made progress, but so much depends on what the city says must be done next meeting. Can we by consensus stop or redirect the *musts*?"
- "This process is working for me and has brought better understanding for me in regards to the decisions that will be made."
- "Tough to move forward. Attendance is lower this week, my group is not here."
- "Slow beginning, but once we got on task we moved forward. Good meeting."

Next Steps
The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 6th at 7:00pm at the Washington Park Center.

1. The agenda will include:
   a. Debrief of previous meeting
   b. Solution Requirements
   c. Setting the stage for moving forward
   d. Presentation by City Staff of mandates/ordinances
   e. Clarification of communication mechanisms
   f. Alternative name/title for the "viper" group
   g. Group responsibilities

March 23 Sign In Sheet

Present	Name	Address	Phone	Email
x	Ginny and Bill Starling		541-683-2512	bgstarling@comcast.net
x	Cathryn Treadway	2820 Friendly	541-689-7410	ctreadway@hotmail.com
x	Cris Jacobson	3280 Whitten Dr	541-344-9924	criswebb@aol.com
	Don Neet	3436 Storey Blvd	541-687-0792	dneet@pacinfo.com
x	Francina Verrijt	Lorane	541-344-3735	fverrijt@pacinfo.com
x	Frank Calciano	975 Crest	541-485-3680	frank@calciano.com
	Fred Lorish	897 West 36th Ave	541-341-3993	florish@comcast.net
x	Hal Huestis	2856 Friendly	541-345-7286	huestisbayley@msn.com
	James McDonald	570 Crest Drive	541-683-6027	ecobuilder1@earthlink.net
	Jim Reed	893 West 37th	541-344-7985	james_reed@comcast.net
x	John Rude	1207 Courtney	541-342-6427	john@agedynamics.com
x	Lyndell Wilken	3065 Whitbeck	541-343-3080	lwbicycle@yahoo.com
x	Mary Rowland	2975 Friendly St	541-345-4195	mmrowland@comcast.net
x	Meg Stewart-Smith	346 Crest Drive	541-913-5464	msdesign5@comcast.net
	Paul Farkas	1268 Courtney	541-485-0859	farkas5@comcast.net
x	Sherie Hawley	3484 Storey Blvd	541-913-2730	sheriehawley@comcast.net
x	Steve West	3025 Friendly St	541-344-9347	
x	Steven Hecker	2990 Friendly St	541-954-1161	shecker@uoregon.edu
x	Tina Gryc	895 Crest Dr	541-345-2281	tinagryc@yahoo.com
x	Bruce Wild	931 Lorane Hwy.		
	*Carmen Bayley	2856 Friendly	541-345-7286	huestisbayley@msn.com
	*Christine Donahue	2988 Madison St	541-683-8220	christinedonahue@msn.com
x	*Kathy Saranpa	3015 Friendly St	541-687-7199	ksaranpa@comcast.net
x	*Clyde Nielson			
x	*Kim O'Brien	2990 Friendly St	541-485-3533	kobrien@uoregon.edu
x	Mark Schoening			mark.a.schoening@ci.eugene.or.us
x	Lisa Gardner			lisa.a.gardner@ci.eugene.or.us
x	David Roth			david.f.roth@ci.eugene.or.us